REMARKS

Claims 1-15 and 17-27 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15, 17, 24, and 25 have been amended and claims 16 and 28-31 have been canceled. Applicants submit that the amendments presented herein raise no new issues requiring further searching or consideration by the Examiner, as the feature of recording a parental code on a disc was previously considered. Applicants further submit that the cancelation of claims 28-30 obviate the § 102 rejection.

I.   The Rejections under 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-16 and 25-27 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, on grounds that the specification fails to provide a written description of the following features recited in claim 1: "blocking viewing of an entire program corresponding to the video signal based on the second parental code." More specifically, the Examiner indicated that there is no disclosure of an "entire program" in the specification, only an "adult program" or "video program."

Use of the word "entire" in claim 1 is not used to describe a type of program (e.g., adult), but rather the amount of a program that is blocked from viewing based on the second parental code. Based on the second parental code, an entire program corresponding to the second parental code can be blocked. This is apparent, for example, from Paragraphs [34], [46], and [58] of the specification, which disclose that when a user requests playback of a program or title from a disk, a parental blocking operation for a program (e.g., an adult program) is performed. Thus, no portion of the program is available for viewing in order to protect children.

Thus, the word "entire" in the phrase "entire program" refers to the amount of a program to be blocked, in this case all of or the entire program. This phrase distinguishes the

claims from Ostrover, which only blocks objectionable scenes of a program without blocking other scenes in the same program. In view of these considerations, Applicants submit that the specification provides a written description of the phrase "entire program" sufficient to satisfy the requirements of § 112.

Claims 17-24 were rejected on grounds that the specification fails to provide a written description that a user-selected code can be "overwritten" with another user-selected code. For these features, Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to Paragraphs [35] and [37] which disclose that, according to one non-limiting embodiment, the source of the video signal may be a recordable (DVD-RW) disk. Paragraph [34] then discloses that a code value indicative of a parental level may be stored as navigation information on the disk.

In accordance with claim 17, this code value may be changed at the request of a user. The change is accomplished by updating and storing the user-selected code value. This may be accomplished by overwriting or in another way. In order to more closely correspond to the invention as disclosed in the specification, claim 17 has been amended to recite that "the parental code is a user-selected code configured to be "updated" with another user-selected code by a command. (See, for example, Paragraph [47] for support).

Applicants submit that the foregoing amendment is sufficient to overcome the § 112 rejection as applied to claims 17-24.

II.   The Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-16, 25, 27, and 31 were rejected for being obvious in view of a Lewis-Sawabe-Kim combination. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that "the second parental code corresponds to one of a plurality of parental levels <u>selected by a user</u> for the video signal" and that "the second parental grade code is <u>recorded in a navigation area of a disc</u> from which the video signal is received." (See, for example, Paragraph [34] of the specification for support). These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references.

More specifically, the cited references disclose a parental rating (e.g., PG, R, etc.) stored on a recording medium such as a DVD. When the rating is detected, all or a portion of the program is blocked for viewing. The cited references further make clear that the DVD comes with this rating information pre-recorded. The user (e.g., a parent) therefore has not control over the rating of the program stored on the disc.

In contrast to the cited references, the claimed invention allows a user (parent) to set his or her own rating and to have this rating recorded in a navigation area of a disc. The parent therefore, and not the DVD manufacturer, makes the decision as to how objectionable the program on the DVD is, e.g., a parent's standards may be different from the generic rating system used by the motion picture association of America to rate movies.

This second parental grade code selected by the user is recorded on the disc and then later read. Viewing of the entire program is then blocked based on detection of the second parental code in the navigation area of the disk.

Applicants submit the features added by amendment to claim 1 are sufficient to patentably distinguish this claim from a Lewis-Sawabe-Kim combination. Furtherance of claim 1 and its dependent claims to allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 25 has been amended to recite features similar to those which patentably distinguish claim 1 from the cited references. Furtherance of claim 25 and its dependent claims to allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 17-24 were rejected for being obvious in view of a Sawabe-Kim-Park combination. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 17 recites a second memory area configured to store a parental code that controls viewing access to a video program in the video signal, wherein "the parental code is a user-selected code configured to be <u>updated and recorded in the second memory area with another user-selected code by a command</u>." The Kim patent does not teach or suggest these features, i.e., in Kim a rating set by the manufacturer is recorded on the DVD. The user is not allowed to set the rating <u>to be recorded on the DVD</u>, which also contains the program to be blocked. Thus, Kim does not teach or suggest the second memory area of claim 17, and neither do any of the other references of record.

In addition, claim 17 recites "a third memory area configured to store status information indicating the renewal of the parental code recorded in the second memory area." These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination. Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 17 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claims 4, 5, and 7 were rejected for being obvious in view of a Lewis-Sawabe-Kim-Ostrover combination. Applicants traverse this rejection on grounds that the Ostrover publication does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1 missing from the Lewis, Sawabe, and Kim references. Claim 26 was rejected based on a similar combination of references. Applicants submit that claim 26 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 25.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DYK/SWN/krf
Date: **January 15, 2009**
Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610
\\Fk4\Documents\2031\2031-032\178499.doc